



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/718,870 | 11/20/2000 | Eric Engstrom | 112076-138351 | 2255 |

25943 7590 03/09/2006

SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT, P.C.
PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900
1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE
PORTLAND, OR 97204

EXAMINER

VU, KIEU D

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2173

DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/718,870 | Applicant(s) ENGSTROM ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Kieu D. Vu | Art Unit 2173 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-15 and 17-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-15, 17-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 12/07/05.
2. Claims 1-5, 7-15, and 17-33 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 11, 13-15, 21-25, 27-28, and 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz et al (USP 5,880,733) and Dalal et al ("Dalal", USP 6363404

Regarding claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28, Horvitz teaches rendering on a display of an apparatus, a metaphoric desktop having a front surface and a back surface (front plane 38, back plane 44); rendering first execution results of first one or more applications on a front surface (front plane) (see the front plane 38 and the back plane 44 in Fig. 3), the front surface being a current visible surface of the metaphoric desktop resulting in the first execution results being visible (Fig. 3 shows that front plane 38 is a current visible face of the desktop), rendering second execution results of second one or more applications on the back surface of the metaphoric desktop (see the back plane 44 in Fig. 3) (also see lines 45-59 of col. 10), morphing the current visible surface of the

Art Unit: 2173

metaphoric desktop from the front surface to the back surface of the metaphoric desktop to make visible the second execution results (see the transformation caused by the push back button 64; col 3, lines 61-65). Horvitz does not explicitly teach that said front surface and said back surface being opposite facing surfaces and the back surface being currently visible which causes the second execution results invisible and morphing the invisible back surface to the visible front surface to make the back surface visible. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Dalal. Dalal teaches a system for providing user-interfacing within textures of 3-D models (col 1, lines 60-65). Dalal further teaches that the model has opposite facing surfaces (three visible sides 90, 92, 94 and three non-visible sides, see Fig. 3, Fig. 4A-4C, col 6, lines 15-25). Dalal further teaches that morphing the invisible back surface to the visible front surface to make the back surface visible (non-visible side is brought into view via the rotation of model 88) (col 7, lines 42-47) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Horvitz and Dalal before him at the time the invention was made to include the rotation to bring non-visible side into view to taught by Dalal in Horvitz's desktop with the motivation being to enable the user to view all of the surfaces of the desktop.

Regarding claims 3, 13, 22, 27, and 30, Horvitz teaches the transition (morphing) from the front surface to the back surface as the front plane is transformed (morphed) to the back plane in response to detection of an event (event of selecting push back button 64) (see col. 12, lines 31-50, also see figure 13, col. 19, lines 32-61).

Regarding claims 4, 14 and 23, Horvitz further teaches that planes can be rotated 90, 180, 270 or 360 degrees over the vertical axis as illustrated in figure 13.

Regarding claims 5, 15 and 24, Horvitz further teaches that plurality of the planes (plurality of portion of metaphoric desktop) can be rotated 90, 180, 270 or 360 degrees over the vertical axis as illustrated in figure 13.

Regarding claims 31-33, Horvitz further teaches that plurality of the planes (plurality of portion of metaphoric desktop) can be rotated 180 degrees over the vertical axis as illustrated in figure 13 and horizontal axis as illustrated in fig. 6A-6C (also see col 15, lines 1-5).

5. Claims 2,12, 26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Dalal, and Boneh et al (hereinafter "Boneh", USP 6760750).

Regarding claims 2 ,12, 26, 29, Horvitz differs from the claim in that Horvitz neither teaches that second application is on-line application nor teaches monitoring the apparatus for being connected on-line. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Boneh. Boneh teaches a system for updating a web page with rapidly changing information (col 3, lines 31-32). Boneh teaches that the system includes an invisible pane and a visible pane wherein the visible pane is updated with the status of the on-line application (col 4, lines 5-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Horvitz and Boneh before him at the time the invention was made to include a web-browser as a windows applications in Horvitz's desktop with the motivation being to enable world wide web access for Horvitz's desktop.

Art Unit: 2173

6. Claims 7 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Dalal and Taylor et al (hereinafter "Taylor", USP 6552733).

Regarding claims 7 and 17, Horvitz teaches storing pictorial representation of said first execution results of the first one or more applications into a standard display screen buffer by a graphic service (col 11, lines 43-46). Horvitz differs from the claim in that Horvitz does not explicitly specify that the display of the execution result of the second applications comprises redirecting the graphics service to store pictorial representations of the results of the first application to an alternate display buffer and to store pictorial representations of the results of the second application to the current display buffer. However, the feature of multiple position buffers is known in the art as taught by Taylor. Taylor teaches a system for morphing which includes multiple position buffers which are associated with morphing operations (col 9, lines 13-18). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply multiple position buffers taught by Taylor to Horvitz's system to redirect the results of the first application to an alternate display buffer and to store pictorial representations of the results of the second application in the current display buffer with the motivation being to enable the system to properly display the result of the second application and not the first application.

7. Claims 8-10 and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horvitz, Dalal, Taylor, and Boneh.

Regarding claims 8 and 18, Horvitz differs from the claim in that Horvitz neither teaches second application is on-line application nor teaches monitoring the apparatus

for being connected on-line. However, such feature is known in the art as taught by Boneh. Boneh teaches a system for updating a web page with rapidly changing information (col 3, lines 31-32). Boneh teaches that the system includes an invisible pane and a visible pane wherein the visible pane is updated with the status of the on-line application (col 4, lines 5-16). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teaching of Horvitz and Boneh before him at the time the invention was made to include a web-browser as a windows applications in Horvitz's desktop with the motivation being to enable world wide web access for Horvitz's desktop.

Regarding claims 9-10 and 19-20, when the user select the first application again for display, the system of Horvitz would then resume storing the pictorial representations of the results of the first application in the current or standard display buffer.

8. The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach animating or rotating multi-faced objects which relates to the claimed invention.

9. Applicant's arguments filed 12/07/05 have been considered.

Applicant's argument "Each of claims 1, 11, 21, 25, and 28 has been amended to clearly recite..... Accordingly, neither windows 38 and 44, nor anything else in Horvitz, teach or suggest the required rendering on the front and back opposite surfaces of a metaphoric desktop" is now moot under new ground of rejection.

Applicant's argument regarding the Nason reference is now moot since the Nason reference is no longer applied in the rejection.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kieu D. Vu. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Thu from 7:00AM to 3:00PM at 571-272-4057.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cabeca, can be reached at 571-272-4048.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

571-273-8300

and / or:

Art Unit: 2173

571-273-4057 (use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper / amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions).

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kieu D. Vu', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Kieu D. Vu
Primary Examiner